

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present case. Claims 1 and 9 are amended herein. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Robsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,309).

103 Rejection

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Robsky et al. (US Patent No. 5,838,309). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claims 1-20 are neither shown nor suggested by Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Robsky et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which is drawn to a display assembly for a portable electronic device that comprises:

... a digitizer mechanism comprising a top film and a resistive digitizer element; and a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said touch screen assembly and said top film of said digitizer mechanism and that is coupled to said top film to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism ...

Independent Claims 9 and 16 recite distinguishing limitations similar to those recited in Claim 1. Claims 2-8 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 10-15 depend from

independent Claim 9, and Claims 17-20 depend from independent Claim 16 and set forth additional limitations of embodiments of the present invention.

The cited combination fails to anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16 as each of the references employed in the cited combination fails to teach or suggest limitations that are set forth in these Claims. In particular, the base reference, Applicants' prior art Figure 1, does not teach or suggest an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly that includes "a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said touch screen assembly and said top film of said digitizer mechanism and that is coupled to said top film to operate therewith as a single physical layer and to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism" as is set forth in Claim 1 (claims 9 and 16 contain similar limitations). In contrast, Applicants' prior art Figure 1 shows a dissimilar touch screen assembly that that does not include a single piece cover enclosure that is disposed over and encloses the touch screen assembly and the top film of the digitizer mechanism and that acts as a single physical layer with the top film. More specifically, as is clearly shown in Applicants' Figure 1, the outermost protective film 110 which is equated in the outstanding Office Action to the recited single piece cover enclosure, does not enclose the touch screen assembly with which it is associated. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Applicants' prior art Figure 1 because of the failure of Applicants' prior art Figure 1 to teach or suggest these limitations.

Robsky et al. does not teach or suggest a modification of Applicants' prior art Figure 1 that would remedy the deficiencies of Applicants' prior art Figure 1 noted above. More specifically, Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Robsky et al. does not render obvious an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly that includes "a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said touch screen assembly and said top film of said digitizer mechanism and is coupled to said top film to operate therewith as a single physical layer and to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover enclosure and said digitizer mechanism" as is recited in Claim 1 (claims 9 and 16 contain similar limitations). Robsky et al. teaches a dissimilar self-tensioning membrane touch screen assembly (see abstract). It should be noted that structure 24 of Robsky et al. is equated to the single piece cover enclosure of Claim 1 in the outstanding Office Action. However, as is shown in by Robsky et al. at Figure 1, structure 24 only partially encloses components of the touch screen assembly that is disclosed by Robsky et al. and is not coupled to act as a single physical layer with structures that are provided underneath (there is a space between structure 24 and the other structures that lie beneath it). In fact, nowhere in the Robsky et al. reference is a cover enclosure that is disposed over and encloses a touch screen assembly and a top film coupled to the top film to operate therewith as a single physical layer as is set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Applicants' prior art Figure 1 and Robsky et al. either alone or in combination.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' prior art Figure 1 and Robsky et al., either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the embodiments of

Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 9, and 16 and, as such, Claims 1, 9, and 16 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 10-15 dependent on Claim 9, and Claim 17-20 dependent on Claim 16 likewise overcome the cited combination as being dependent on an allowable base claim and therefore are themselves in condition for allowance.

SUMMARY


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application and allowance of the pending Claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Reginald A. Ratliff at (408) 938-9060.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 9/27, 2005


Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No.: 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060